

Questions and Answers

Where is the money coming from?

Government	\$190 million
Eden Park Trust	\$12 million
NZ Rugby	\$10 million
Unfunded	\$28.5 million
Total required	\$240.5 million

How confident are you that you can close this funding gap?

Very confident. The gap does not take account of a possibly higher contribution from the Eden Park Trust Board, as well as possible contributions from Auckland City Council, Auckland Regional Council, other grants and sponsors and commercial partners.

Why are ARC and ACC not making a contribution?

The possibility of local government funding remains live. We will be continuing to work with both councils to see whether they will reconsider making what is only a very small percentage of the total construction cost. Given the legacy which Auckland will be left with the new design, we are hopeful that there will be a generally held public view by Aucklanders that some contribution is reasonable.

Do other stadium in NZ receive local body funding?

Yes. Waikato Stadium, Westpac Stadium and AMI Stadium are all operated by (or under trust/corporate structures), and were funded from, local government sources. The Dunedin City Council has proposed \$60M of funding towards the redevelopment of Carisbrook. Eden Park has operated for 100 years without Council funding, but cannot now continue to be maintained without capital contributions from a range of public sources.

Who will own the Park after public money is put into it?

The Park has been a private trust operating for the benefit of Auckland Rugby and Auckland Cricket since its establishment. However, a condition of Government funding has been that there must be long term governance changes at the Park which will see the majority of trustees being publicly appointed, and the primary trust objective as being to operate the Park for the benefit of all Aucklanders. Legislative changes to the Eden Park Trust Act will be required to implement these changes.

Has there been a cost blow out?

No, the price for the Baseline Scheme (a new South Stand and temporary seats in the East and West) remains the same at \$197M. The difference in costs relates to a materially different design proposal. The enhancements which will significantly mitigate any risks associated with consenting, will provide residents and patrons alike with a better functioning stadium, and will leave Auckland with a valuable legacy for future generations to enjoy.

What is the resource consenting process from this stage?

The Park was granted consents for redevelopment in January this year. That was a significantly larger, and more costly, development. As the proposed plans deliver all of the benefits of the new scheme (e.g. ensuring crowd movement is now internalised by creating public concourses), while having fewer negative effects (e.g. the stands heights are lower and the long-term capacity has been reduced from 60,000 – 50,000), we expect the variations will be sufficiently within the scope for it to be approved with no, or limited, public notification.

We have worked very closely with the city planners at Auckland City Council and we do not anticipate any significant problems that can't be solved within our timeframe for commencing construction.

Are you expecting any reaction from the local residents groups?

We have maintained regular contact with residents throughout the redevelopment. We've invited any concerned resident to contact us for any points of clarification. Our consultation with the neighbours will be ongoing. While it is impossible to satisfy everyone with a development of this scale, we have maintained a very open relationship with residents and we believe the enhanced design is a better outcome for them.

What are the key factors that make this option better for the residents?

- Lights will be located in the roofline reducing light spill with the existing lighting towers will be demolished.
- There is an acoustic barrier that will reduce noise levels during events. The top portion of the barrier will be glassed to make it more attractive when viewed from the exterior.
- A landscaped green buffer zone will provide a softening visual barrier for residents. This will replace asphalt and concrete.

- Better access to the Park will be provided from four corner entry plazas, and patrons will reach their seats via an internal concourse. This means people won't have to circumnavigate the park out on the streets to reach their seats.
- The post cup capacity is reduced from 54,000 to 50,000, which is an increase of only approx. 3,000 to the capacity at the moment.
- Improved public access (via an elevated public plaza and concourse) between Kingsland Station/Walters Ave, the stadium and the bus/coach terminal in the south west of the park.

Given the massive pressure on the construction industry is there a danger it can't be built in time?

There will always be risks with a project of this scale and timeline. However, the Board has assembled a project team that has leading international designers, engineers and cost planners. It is also negotiating with Fletcher Construction for the main contractor role who have an unparalleled record in delivering projects in New Zealand. There are peer reviews of every stage of the project's design and construction, and a Project Risk Management Group reviews all risks on a fortnightly basis.

To date every key stage has been delivered on schedule, and every indication is that the project will remain on schedule for delivery by the end of 2010. This leaves ample time for final RWC 2011 preparations.

What is the timeline for consents, demolition, start and finish of construction?

A project timeline is attached.

How confident are you that the \$240.5 million will be the final price and won't blow out ?

While there is always the possibility of minor changes with the budget, there is little or no prospect of a "blow out" for several reasons:

- We have significant provision within the budget (\$29M) for contingencies and escalations;
- We are now into the third of five design changes and so the uncertainties are continually reducing.
- The baseline scheme has not changed from the \$197M in the 6 months we have been working on the design;
- We are bringing the main contractor into the process early to minimise construction cost changes; and
- We have experienced cost planners continually reviewing the budget.

Are temporary seats of sufficient standard to host a world class event like the RWC 2011?

Yes. Temporary seats (or relocatable seats as they are known as) are now part of all major international sporting and musical events. By way of example, the Olympic Stadium for London 2012 will have 55,000 temporary seats out of a total 80,000 seats. These seats are of the same quality and dimensions as permanent seats in modern stadiums.